



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/525,412	03/08/2006	Norio Sakuragawa	0760-0344PUS1	5108
2252	7590	01/07/2009		
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				EXAMINER KIM, TAEYOON
		ART UNIT 1651		
		PAPER NUMBER ELECTRONIC		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/07/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/525,412	Applicant(s) SAKURAGAWA ET AL.
	Examiner TAEYOON KIM	Art Unit 1651

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3 and 4 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3 and 4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1648)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3 and 4 are pending.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

Applicant's amendment and response filed on 9/29/2008 has been received and entered into the case.

Claims 2 and 5 are canceled, and claims 1, 3 and 4 are pending and have been considered on the merits. All arguments have been fully considered.

It is acknowledged that a certified English translation of the foreign priority document has been received and is considered. The benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) is granted and thus, the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) based on Nikaido, and the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hung et al. in view of Nikaido are withdrawn.

The claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd para., has been withdrawn based on the persuasive argument.

The claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 to claims 2 and 5 has been withdrawn due to the amendment.

In the response to the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Hung et al. in light of Whittle et al., applicant argued that the mesenchymal stem cells (MSC) of Hung et al. is derived from placenta, and the placenta is originated from the mother while amnion is originated from the fetus. However, it is extremely well known in the art that placenta is composed of maternal originated tissue but also tissue (membrane) of fetal origin such as chorion and amnion (see attached reference entitled "placenta and

extraembryonic membrane"). According to the reference, placenta is composed of villous chorion (fetal portion) and decidua basalis (maternal portion) (see p.1). Thus, the placenta is not just maternal originated but it is also fetal origin. In addition, chorion is attached to amnion, and thus, it is considered that placenta encloses chorion, amnion and decidua. Even though the placenta disclosed by Hung et al. is considered different from the amnion of the claimed invention, Hung et al. also disclose that MSC can be derived from umbilical cord (para. 26), which comprises amnion that is fetal origin (see p.4). Thus, Hung et al. in light of Whittle et al. anticipate the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hung et al. (US 2002/0045260) in light of Whittle et al. (2000; Placenta).

Hung et al. teach mesenchymal stem cells capable of differentiating into bone cells (see abstract) obtainable from placenta or umbilical cord (see para. 26), and a method of culturing mesenchymal stem cells in an osteogenic culture medium to differentiate the mesenchymal stem cells into osteoblasts (see para. 37, Example 4). Hung et al. also teach a method of tissue replacement (considered as transplantation) using mesenchymal stem cells (see abstract), and transplanting mesenchymal stem cells (see para. 32).

Claim 1 is a product-by-process claim. M.P.E.P. § 2113 reads, "Product-by-process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps."

"Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted).

The structure implied by the process steps should be considered when assessing the patentability of product-by-process claims over the prior art, especially where the product can only be defined by the process steps by which the product is made, or where the manufacturing process steps would be expected to impart distinctive structural characteristics to the final product. See, e.g., *In re Garnero*, 412 F.2d 276, 279, 162 USPQ 221, 223 (CCPA 1979)

The use of 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections for product-by-process claims has been approved by the courts. "[T]he lack of physical description in a product-by-process claim makes determination of the patentability of the claim more difficult, since in spite of the fact that the claim may recite only process limitations, it is the patentability of the product claimed and not of the recited process steps which must be established. We are therefore of the opinion that when the prior art discloses a product which reasonably appears to be either identical with or only slightly different than a product

claimed in a product-by-process claim, a rejection based alternatively on either section 102 or section 103 of the statute is eminently fair and acceptable. As a practical matter, the Patent Office is not equipped to manufacture products by the myriad of processes put before it and then obtain prior art products and make physical comparisons therewith." *In re Brown*, 459 F.2d 531, 535, 173 USPQ 685, 688 (CCPA 1972).

Nevertheless, Hung et al. disclose the source of human mesenchymal stem cells being placenta or umbilical cord (see above) and it is well known in the art that amniotic mesenchymal cell layers is a part of amniotic membrane of placenta in light of Whittle et al. (see abstract and p.395), the mesenchymal stem cells of the references derived from placenta are considered to encompass the mesenchymal stem cells separated from amniotic mesenchymal cell layer.

Thus, the reference anticipates the claimed subject matter.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAEYOON KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-9041. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:00 pm ET (Mon-Thu).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Leon B Lankford/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1651

Taeyoon Kim
AU-1651